DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 222 SP 034 215

AUTHOR Bauer, Norman J.
TITLE In Search of the Distinctive Contributions of the Social Foundations of Education to the Preparation of Teachers.
PUB DATE Nov 92
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Studies Association (Pittsburgh, PA, November 4-8, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Foundations of Education; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; Position Papers; *Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Associations; *Social Influences; *Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS American Educational Studies Association; Council of Learned Societies in Education; Social Foundations of Education

ABSTRACT

Design flaws in the curricula of some teacher education programs prevent prospective teachers from encountering empowering opportunities necessary to acquire alternative perspectives about planning for classroom instruction. This paper looks at ways to cope with the failure to recognize the importance of alternative perspectives by: (1) analyzing a publication titled "The STANDARDS for Academic and Professional Instruction in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies" from the Council of Learned Societies in Education (CLSE Standards); (2) analyzing the draft position paper of the American Educational Studies Association (AESA) Committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation titled "Toward a New Consensus among Social Foundations Educators" (TNC); and (3) suggesting five actions for AESA to consider as it searches for the distinctive contributions of social foundations of education (SFE) to the preparation of teachers. The five suggestions pertain to the CLSE Standards, the political and scholarly activity required of foundations scholars, the name used to label SFE, a potential AESA project (a reference book with common information on SFE), and the importance of the construction and distribution of a position paper about the means and ends of SFE instruction. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353222

IN SEARCH OF THE DISTINCTIVE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION TO THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS

by

Norman J. Bauer, Ed.D.
Professor of Social Foundations of Education
School of Education
State University of New York
Geneseo, NY 14454

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Bauer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Annual Meeting
American Educational Studies Association
Pittsburgh, PA
November 4 - 8, 1992

SP034215

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IN SEARCH OF THE DISTINCTIVE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION TO THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS

Norman J. Bauer

November 5, 1992

Introduction

During the past six months I have engaged in sustained educational conversations, one during the annual meeting of a Foundations of Education Association, the other during a departmental meeting, with well educated colleagues, persons with earned doctorates from reputable institutions, who have made claims about the programmatic needs of prospective teachers regarding the question of how best to plan for classroom instruction. Their claims revealed how thoroughly hegemonized they have been by the behaviorist perspective. In each case it quickly became apparent that these persons lacked a tacit awareness of the range of perspectives available to one who is engaged in planning for classroom instruction. Oppressed by a reified consciousness, they revealed just how elusive a concept 'education' has proven to be for many of our well educated colleagues.

In these two cases, and I suspect in many more, their backgrounds of intellectual preparation and their experiential base has not enabled them

to see this concept, as Frankena has revealed, from at least four different perspectives: "(1) the *activity of educating* carried on by teachers, schools, and parents (or by oneself), (2) the *process of being educated* (or learning) which goes on in the pupil or child, (3) the *result,* actual or intended, of (1) and (2), and (4) the *discipline* or field of enquiry that studies or reflects on (1), (2), and (3) and is taught in schools of education."[1] (Italics in the original.)

Clearly it may be that because of design flaws in the curricular programs of professional preparation pursued by these persons they may not have encountered the empowering opportunities necessary for them to have acquired alternative perspectives about planning for classroom instruction which would be likely to have emerged from a conscious awareness of Frankena's fourth perspective.

Purpose

This paper has been designed to cope with the failure to recognize the importance of this fourth perspective (1) by developing a brief analysis of the publication entitled The STANDARDS for Academic and Professional Instruction in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies of the Council of Learned Societies in Education (hereafter referred to as CLSE Standards),[2] originally developed and adopted by the American Educational Studies Association in 1977; and, during the years since, endorsed by the other members of the Council; (2) by analyzing the Draft Position Paper of the American Educational Studies Association Committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation which is entitled "Toward a New Consensus Among Social Foundations Educators,"[3] (hereafter referred to as TNC) and which has been made available to all

AESA members for discussion and revision at the November,1992, Annual Conference of the Association in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and (3) by suggesting a number of actions which AESA might consider as it continues its dialogue and search for the distinctive contributions of social foundations of education to the preparation of teachers.

Assumptions

This paper is based on an acceptance by the author of three major assumptions. These basic premises claim that (1) in many institutions that prepare teachers throughout the country a major identity crisis confronts the Foundations of Education at the present time; (2) there is no clear recognition either by faculty within teacher preparation or by policy makers external to teacher preparation of the distinctive contributions which study in the broad field of the Foundations of Education can and does make to the preparation of teachers; and (3) there are external evaluators at work who could sharply diminish or significantly alter the role of the Foundations of Education in the preparation and continued development of teachers in the future.[4]

CLSE Standards

While I would like to have seen the consistent use of normative language in that portion of the CLSE publication which describes seven significant standards that pertain to foundational study, I remain deeply convinced that the discourse contained within the Standards segment of the publication continues to be most significant as a guide for all institutions engaged today in teacher preparation.

Of the remainder of the publication, however, I have two serious

reservations: (1) While the languages of the interpretive, the normative, and the critical can be clearly related to the task of instruction in the foundations, it does not seem to me that they are in each case logically connected with the notion of 'perspective'. Interpretive, normative and critical thought are in reality intellectual skills and processes which we employ to explain, to make sense of, to comprehend the significance of our cognitive perspectives or structures.

Perhaps an example will make my concern clear. Consider one potential problem which would emerge from the Bush Education 2000 [5] proposal. This proposal contained no fewer than eight specific references to *Choice* of schooling, stressing nonpublic, including religious, schools. A foundations scholar analyzing this proposal would want her students to construct a clear understanding of (a) the first sixteen words of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution; [6] (b) Jefferson's declaration of a 'wall of separation' between Church and State which he included in his letter to the Danbury Baptist Association, January 1, 1802; [7] (c) the strict constructionist point of view held by separationists; and (d) the view held by religious accommodationists reflected on August 11, 1984, when Congress passed the Equal Access Act. [8]

Good comprehension of the significant attributes of each of these matters would enable one to shape a clear intellectual perspective of the issue created by the stress of the Bush administration on 'Choice'. Once such comprehension is acquired one could then consider the 'separationist' and the 'accommodationist' perspectives critically, interpretively, or normatively. In other words, building a clear mental image of a complex

structure logically precedes any of the three processes. And, depending, of course, on one's circumstances, one's values, one's ends, one could apply each of the processes to these perspectives.

The perspectives revealed by the five articles included in *Alternative Conceptualizations,* the 'Issue Theme' of the Winter, 1992 issue of Educational Foundations, represent an additional example of my reservation. Each of the perspectives revealed in this publication, depending upon one's assumptions, one's ends, and a variety of contextual factors, can be considered from a normative, an interpretive, a critical frame of reference.

A still further example of my reservation about the way 'perspectives' is employed in The Standards can be found in the five ways in which discussion builds understanding of a topic which were identified by Bridges. The object of discussion, notes Bridges, is "to draw out and to explore as fully as possible this range of perspectives." [9] Ideally the goal, observers Bridges, is "neither to decide which one is the 'right' view nor to try somehow to synthesize them into a single coherent perspective, but rather to *understand* (italics in the original) them in their diversity." [10]

Additional examples might include perspectives generated by such Marxists theorists as Giroux and Apple, by such phenomenologists as Pinar and Grumet, by Dewey's empirical naturalism, by Tyler's curricular model, by Thomistic existentialism, by Rudolf Steiners anthroposophy, by Chardin's omega point, by Rorty's incommensurability, etc., etc.

Adler lends further support for this view with his claim that, "According as men hold different conceptions of the relation of language to thought . . . they inevitably take opposite sides on these issues. Whether

the discipline of language is called semantics or the liberal arts, the standards by which one man criticizes the language of another seem to depend upon what holds to be true." 11

It is just simply wrong, in other words, to claim that there are specific normative, critical or interpretive perspectives to be found somewhere. That is just not the case. What we can claim, however, is that there are a significant number of distinct and significant perspectives to which instruction within the broadly-conceived field of foundational studies can and ought to attend .

My second concern pertains to the use of the name 'Foundations of Education' which is employed throughout the CLSE Standards. . The reason for my concern is clearly revealed in a postcard notification from a major publishing company which I received on October 7, 1992, stipulating that, in the near future, I would be receiving a brief questionnaire regarding "the primary, introductory survey course often called *Introduction to Education* or *Foundations of Education*." 12 (Italics mine). Clearly the author of this communication reveals an image of a foundational course as the initial introductory course in a program of teacher preparation, one which is not perceived as substantive but rather as an overview of the field of teacher preparation and career development, one which consists largely of a smattering of ideas which cover the gamut of information deemed necessary by someone considering the pursuit of certification as a classroom teacher. One does not get the impression from such discourse that foundational study is anything but the initial, overview or 'basement' component of a preparatory program, similar to such introductory courses as 'foundations of reading', 'foundations of

math' 'foundations of special education', etc.; each usually connoting the initial course in a program of study, usually designed to provide an overview of the domain of knowledge and skill which is about to be entered.

The preceding view differs in degree but not in kind from what Shulman has described as "the old metaphor of foundations", an image which "comes from the world of construction, where the bigger the building you want to build, the more solid and firm the foundation you must first provide." [13]

This image of the foundations appears to be almost a universal one within teacher education throughout the country. But is it an appropriate one? Shulman suggests that it is not. In its place he draws from the construction industry when he suggests that we might consider employing the metaphor of 'scaffolding' with its suggestion that it would be an integral part of an entire program. The 'scaffolding' then "becomes part of the very structure it is trying to support." Shulman suggests that "we in psychology, history, philosophy, anthropology, and sociology of education should not think of ourselves as foundations but, if you will, as scaffoldings, as the framework for pedagogy." [14]

But, 'thinking' about ourselves and naming ourselves are two quite different activities. As catchy a title as it might seem at first, it would be difficult to imagine any group of faculty seriously considering for approval a title for a course named "Scaffolding 1" or "Introduction to the Scaffolding."

We are left, therefore, with the problem of how best to name our field. What can we do? One alternative would be to adopt the designation

of 'Social Foundations of Education' which is consistently employed in the TNC document about which more will be said later. Clearly such a label would be more likely to transmit an image of inquiry and scholarship which examines and relates the school to various aspects of the social and cultural milieu; for instance, to the technical - how a living is made, to the sociological - how humans relate with one another, to the ideological - how humans believe, to language - how humans communicate.

A second alternative would be to consider an alternative name for the foundations. Given the fact that much emphasis is placed today on the pedagogical aspects of teacher preparation, an emphasis which entails in large measure general and special methods, it might be wise for our organization to consider an alterntive, though clearly related designation, for instance, *educology* .[15] I am well aware of the fact that Steiner has employed the term to describe her effort to ground education in empirical science.[16] The fact that the term has been used in this way, however, does not preclude its being used in another sense, a sense which would make it parallel to such discipline names as psychology, sociology, anthropology, biology, etc., thereby recognizing Frankena's fourth perspective of education. Each of these names entails an array of sub-disciplines which reveal the different specialities of the discipline with which they are associated. Biology, for instance, frequently will include such subdisciplines as ecology, evolution, immunology, plant physiology, animal physiology, cell biology, biochemsity, genetics, etc.; Psychology frequently includes general psychology, statistics, child development, educational psychology, humanistic psychology, cognitive psychology, social psychology, abnormal psychology, psychology of learning, etc.

Clearly these subdivisions of the disciplines provide the foundations with a fine example of how the various subdivisions of foundational studies such as history, philosophy, sociology, psychology, politics, economics, and anthropology of education, religious, comparative and international education, educational studies and educational policy studies could be perceived as subdivisions of what would constitute the name of our discipline: 'educology'. Such a name would be likely to achieve at least three significant ends: (a) it would clearly distinguish our field of endeavor from that of pedagogy, thereby enhancing our unique identity within preparatory programs; (b) it would provide an image of our field which would avoid the notion that ours is largely introductory level instruction designed merely to provide an overview of the field, with bits of information about what one might encounter in the future as one's professional preparation ensues; and (c) it would reveal both the transdisciplinary relationship of educology with cognate disciplines, and the cross-disciplinary nature of knowledge and instruction which we consider vital to the preparation of teachers.

Regardless of which direction we eventually take regarding the name of our field, however, we need to recognize that, as Tozer and others have done elsewhere, "To question the application of the foundations metaphor to teacher education is not to diminish in any way the fundamental meaning of psychological and social foundations as bases on which teaching and learning processes must inevitably rest." [17]

TNC

Let us now turn our attention to the position paper which has

generated our symposium today by addressing five significant matters: (a) the definition of educational foundations; (b) the aims and values to be derived from instruction in the educational foundations, (c) the means, including the content and the instructional processes, of instruction in the educational foundations, (d) the threat to the continued existence of educational foundations, and (e) the problem posed by any hope we may cherish that we can achieve a broad and deep consensus of agreement among foundations scholars about the the aims and means of instruction in a domain of study as diverse as the foundations of education.

Thus far in this paper, save for the title, I have deliberately refrained from employing the term 'social foundations of education,' using, instead, the language of 'educational foundations' which was employed consistently and throughout The STANDARDS.

Without mentioning the change in nomenclature which he employed in his paper, perhaps, given the fact that the paper employs the heading "Toward a More Adequate Definition ...", unaware of the name change which he was in fact making, Professor Tozer, the author of TNC, consistently names our field of endeavor the 'social foundations of education.' (Hereafter referred to as SFE). This is no insignificant change, for, by doing this, he has employed a name which is much more in line with the intentions of those who, in the 1930's, originally conceived the SFE, a name which had clearly different connotations than today's 'foundations of education', with its connotation as an 'overview' of a program of study. Further, he has accurately described the SFE as a cross-disciplinary field of study which is concerned with 'socio-cultural phenomena', with the 'economic conditions, structures, processes, and the beliefs of a culture; its political ideas and institutions; its beliefs and values about what it is

to be human;...' [18]

In his discussion of the aims of SFE instruction, however, Professor Tozer appears to continue what I have alluded to earlier as a misguided acceptance of the phrases 'interpretive perspectives', 'normative perspectives' and 'critical perspectives', as they are found in the CLSE Standards, deviating only with the claim that they 'offer only partial guidance' for SFE instruction. [19] I say 'appears' because this may, in actuality, not be a valid observation, for later in his paper he argues that SFE study should expose students to "ideologicaly heterogeneous rather than homogeneous" [20] study so that students can recognize "how competing ideological perspectives influence meaning-construction and how such differences in interpretation can influence decision-making in educational practice."[21] A bit later he makes the claim that "SFE instruction offers the most concentrated opportunity available to prospective and practicing teachers to engage in sustained, disciplined inquiry into the sociological, historical, philosophical, and other cultural dimensions of the problems of teaching practice with those whose disciplinary specialties are most dedicated to such dimensions. In the degree to which such experience engages teachers in articulating and questioning their own veiws in the face of alternative interpretations available in these literatures, the construction of new and disciplined meanings becomes possible."[22] Clearly he is implying here that there are significant perspectives which students can acquire from each of these disciplines, perspectives which the prospective teacher will be enabled to use as a means to direct and discipline her critical, normative and interpretive thought, but which are not *in themselves* critical, normative or interpretive perspectives.

He is surely correct when he raises the question 'why teachers would want (or why we think they should want) sharpened abilities to examine and explain educational processes.;... Will all of this make them better teachers?" He is insightfully aware of how our pedagogically oriented colleagues frequently raise the question of the value of the SFE for their students. [23]

His response to these demanding questions entails three major points, the need for SFE instruction to foster "a sense of the vocation of teaching," the need for SFE instruction to recognize that teaching involves the continual construction of meaning which guides the decision-making of a teacher, and that instruction in the SFE can "engage students in questioning their prior assumptions," stressing the "questioning of their own taken-for-granteds," thereby facilitating the acquisition of new meanings that "have the potential for influencing future judgments and responses to teaching situations" by the students as they pursue their careers. [24]

His stress on the notion of 'vocation' is refreshing in its attempt to break from the notion that teaching constitutes a 'profession'. An analysis of the clear uses, borderline uses and clear misuses of the name 'profession' would quickly reveal that, at the very best, teaching at any level of schooling does not satisfy the criteria of a pure profession such as medicine or law. At best we can call ourselves pseudoprofessionals, clearly borderline examples of the pure professions. Whatever the position we occupy in the schooling enterprise, we are indeed engaged in vocational activity. This conception that teacher preparation is concerned with the vocation of men and women, preparing them in thought and action for the

purposes and means which they will pursue in life appears to be a quite defensible claim.

My concern about Tozer's conception of 'vocation', however, lies in the fact that it could easily lead to the misinformed and misguided conclusion that only a minimum of general education, as well as only a minimum, if any at all, of SFE (the general education component of a teacher education program) would suffice as preparation for teaching. If such a reality were to emerge, prospective teachers could end up pursuing a preparation which would sharply distort and limit the proper use of their intellectual capacities, reducing them to membership in that body of human beings who, because of the division of labor, are confined in their daily endeavors to the use of a few simple skills. This likely deskilling outcome, elicited by the 'vocations' concept, caused by its being superficially understood, would end with the development of teachers with little ability to draw on their understandings or to exercise creative decision-making capacities when confronted with the impediments of the uncertain situations which they constantly encounter.

Dewey stressed this concern when he argued that "A truly liberal, and liberating, education would refuse today to isolate vocational training on any of its levels from a continuous education in the social, moral and scientific contexts within which wisely administered callings and professions must function. [25] Intellectual torpor, mechanical activity, the inability to engage in serious, rational and reflective conversation, and the inability to empathize, think openly and generously , hence the inability to make just decisions would be among the likely outcomes of such preparation. In other words, the preparation that prospective

teachers would very likely receive under this notion, if it were not adequately comprehended, would not be likely fully to develop their common humanity; hence it would deskill them in terms of their ability to function not only in formal schools, but also in the larger culture as intelligent, resourceful, moral citizens. Clearly instruction in the SFE could offset this potential outcome. It seems to follow that, given the diverse nature of our culture, and the need to acquire the intellectual and moral dispositions necessary to function effectively in it, if our teachers are to pursue their teaching and public lives in ways which will facilitate the just development of this society, they should receive a large measure of liberating, perspective-creating education, both within their arts and science curricula as well as within their teacher preparation programs.

Tozer's stress on the almost continual need for classroom teachers to engage in meaning-construction which will then affect their decision-making is closely allied to this need for teacher preparation programs to foster the acquisition of an array of perspectives. These general perspectives, of course, remain within what Polyani would call the tacit dimension of our beings,[26] what Broudy would call 'with' knowledge.[27] The continually uncertain situations which teachers encounter in their classroom practice requires them to make-meaning, meaning which compels them to reflect back from the ends which they are pursuing to the perspectives which they have acquired. As these ends, perspectives, and their uncertain situational contexts interact, their decision-making and the practices which ensue may be significantly affected.

An example or two might make this clear. Often our public schools, committed to the end of inculcating loyalty to our country, require their

students to stand and recite the pledge of allegiance to our flag on a daily basis. If a student refuses to stand or to engage in saying the pledge the teacher will be confronted with the need (a) to make sense of this action, (b) to relate to the ends which the school is attempting to pursue and (c) to his background of perspectives, in order to to make a sound and valid judgment about how to handle this situation. Practical examples of this sort abound, examples in which tacitly held perspectives, coupled with an awareness of the ends being pursued and the uncertainties created within the human dimensions of classroom instruction jointly affect the decision making of teachers.

For instance, consider such practical examples as the teaching of values and the problem of relativism in a diverse culture which one often confronts when values are considered, prioritizing and the means by which such activity can be pursued, the limited prerogatives of teachers during their probationary years, language questions regarding distinctions in discourse such as 'will be able to' and 'should be able to', different senses of the terms 'problem', 'process' and 'purpose', absolute and positional benefits, verbal and non-verbal interaction, mastery versus normal curves, forms of lesson planning, divisible and indivisible expectations, senses of discourse related to 'democracy' and 'liberty', functional, cognitive and behaviorist theories of learning, consensus theory and consensus curves, the nature of slogans, distinctions between ENS, DCS and GWS perspectives,[28] the ends and means of such perspectives, the views of human nature, of subject matter, of curricular organization, of moral theories and the moral nature of classroom teaching, of the theories of learning and who can learn, of theories of

society and democracy, which these perspectives entail, all constitute significant intellectual structures which are likely to be derived largely from SFE instruction. Clearly such tacit knowledges can powerfully influence the future decision-making of prospective teachers. These and many more substantive matters constitute the tacit, liberal, enlarging dimension of the preparation of teachers. Such knowledge should prepare them somewhat for the continuously emerging, uncertain conditions which they will encounter as they structure their work in human ways with human beings in public school classroom environments.

Professor Tozer's final claim that an emphasis on both the sense of vocation and the meaning construction and decision-making activity of teachers can have the effect of inducing them to question their 'prior assumptions', their 'taken-for-granteds', may be the most important aspect of his thinking because, in large measure, it pertains to the problems we face in teacher preparation which are the consequence of the 'b-18' phenomenon.

This 'b-18' phenomenon, the importance and effects of which are largely unëxamined and unmentioned in the professional literature, refers to the subtle conditioning about the nature of teaching which many prospective teachers have undergone during the first eighteen years of their lives. Tozer perceives the effect of this phenomenon clearly when he asserts that "they, [students] enter their professional programs well practiced in understanding educational phenomena in non-scholarly ways, well-practiced in seeing teaching and learning with eyes that have learned to see in ways the dominant culture has trained them to see." [29] Almost totally unconscious of the images of teaching which they have acquired

from their classroom encounters during these early years of life, almost always traditional images of the teacher as a dispenser of information, as a transmitter of knowledge, images which have many of the same components regardless of where in our country, or elsewhere, the student has experienced his lower school instruction, results in many of them commencing their teacher preparation with relatively reified images and dispositions, based on common sense and faulty assumptions about how classroom teaching is and should be done. These images and assumptions frequently compel them to conclude that there is little to understand about teaching save for the need to possess a good measure of knowledge, some methods and the ability to manage behavior, clearly the sort of narrow perspective of teaching which emerged following the establishment of our early normal schools and continuing into the early twentieth century.

When one connects the lasting impact of the 'b-18 phenomenon with the formally structured continuum of teacher preparation, one quickly discovers that Professor Tozer is exceptionally insightful and quite correct when he says that "teacher-educators have [an] opportunity to influence directly only a small part of those [early childhood] experiences"[30] because of two significant factors, the few months that teacher-educators have to influence the structures which their students acquire, and the powerful attenuating influence which field experiences and full-time teaching can have on the prospective teacher.[31]

Professor Tozer's final claim that "if social foundations instruction is successfully to influence teachers' meaning-construction in professional practice, then students will have to be engaged in forming

and articulating meaning for themselves in their social foundations coursework', is surely a highly important recommendation because it compels students to practice the construction of new interpretations, to reinterpret the images which they have acquired as a consequence of the b 18 phenomenon, reinterpretations which are derived from their knowledge, the knowledge "of the most challenging scholarly viewpoints and competing ideological perspectives"[32] which they have acquired during their preparation.

Clearly such writing activity ought to have the effect of inducing students to reconsider their reified frames of reference, to raise serious questions about the practice of teaching, and to acquire the dispositions necessary to engage in the continual pursuit of improved responses to such questions during their professional careers.

Suggestons for action:

Let me offer five suggestions about how we might stimulate a renewal of understanding in the field of teacher preparation about the distinctive contributions of SFE instruction in the preparation of teachers. These will pertain (a) to the CLSE Standards; (b) to the political and scholarly activity required of foundations scholars; (c) to the name we employ to label our field of endeavor; (d) to a potential AESA project;and (e) to the importance of the construction and distribution of a position paper about the ends and means of SFE instruction.

The *Standard's* portion of The CLSE Standards, commencing with page 8, constitutes an important source of understanding about our broad and deep consensual position regarding the importance of institutions

preparing teachers to employ only highly qualified persons as SFE scholars, about the minimal portion of a teacher education program which ought to be the province of the SFE, about graduate programs which entail foundational instruction, about the preparation of foundational faculty, and about the continued professional development of foundational faculty. Save for what I have claimed in this paper is the improper use of 'interpetive, normative and critical perspectives', a problem which could be easily rectified by employing Tozer's notion of "alternative interpetations",[33] this portion of the booklet ought to be reconstructed, with an appropriate introduction, with the consistent use of the name SFE throughout. Multiple copies should be distributed to every SCDE in the country as well as to each of the major teacher education accrediting agencies and important policy makers in each of the fifty states.

Professor Tozer correctly identifies the power of national regulatory agencies to influence the nature of programs of teacher preparation and the vitally important need for foundational scholars to avoid the tendency to remain aloof and apart from the regulatory process. They need to attempt to influence this process, a process which he clearly recognizes as <u>both</u> scholarly <u>and</u> political. Clearly this latter process can interfere with the study and research agendas of foundational scholars. However, because the very existence of foundational study is being seriously threatened in some states, because the identity and justification for the inclusion of foundational study in the preparation of teachers is encountered throughout the land, it behooves every foundational scholar to adopt a proactive political stance as a compliment to, or an integral part of, their research agendas in order to resurrect an

awareness of the importance of foundational study in the preparation of all school personnel.

As I alluded to earlier, the field of SFE suffers from an identity problem which is caused by the narrow connotaton of the name 'foundations of education', which seems to be employed almost everywhere. An improvement on this can almost surely emerge from the adoption and consistent use of the name 'social foundations of education' as Tozer has done in his paper. This may, in fact, be sufficient to induce institutions to revise the name 'foundatons of education', with the intention of drawing a clear distinction between an introductory course referred to as 'foundations of education,' and a scholarly, perspectives-oriented course named 'social foundations of education'. The latter name clearly suggests the relational nature between the school and the culture, suggesting clearly that an analysis of this connection would be the focus of such a course. This possibility notwithstanding, however, I continue to remain somewhat unconvinced that such a name will establish the uniqueness of our identity, or clearly reveal the distinction between, as well as the relationship to, those who labor in the domain of pedagogical theory and practice . It would be much easier for the various sub-disciplines contained in our multidisciplinary field to acquire a clearly distinct identity if they were to be 'housed' in a field with a name comparable to the names employed in the arts and sciences. 'Educology' could well be such a name. Those prepared to labor in this domain would then be designated 'educologists', just as persons prepared to teach in psychology are named 'psychologists,' in biology, ' biologists', etc. The clarity of our identity, as well as the connection of our domain with those in the pedagogical domain, with its subdivisions of reading, math, science,

etc., would make much more visible the importance of SFE content, and make prospective teachers much more cognizant of the fact that they will be much more than simply purveyors of subject matter when they become teachers.

We are all aware of the value of such publications as the **Handbook of Research on Teaching**, the **Encyclopedia of Educational Research**, and the **Handbook of Research on Teacher Education** to any one engaged in the pursuit of scholarly inquiry in the various dimensions of educational theory and practice. These publications, reference books of the first magnitude, represent powerful synoptic efforts to bring together the thinking of the very best people to summarize the results of research from different perspectives. They do not, however, cover the entire spectrum of potential inquiry into the perennially important matters related to the aims and means of education which continue to arise from one generation to the next.

Indeed, we all, I suspect, recognize the validity of Soltis' claim that ". . . few if any basic foundations courses contain the same common elements . . . To claim," as Soltis does, "that students can take any courses they wish to meet the foundations requirement is to openly admit that we all do very different things in teaching foundations [and it is] to reveal an appalling truth about our lack of agreement about what we believe we should be doing in common, and what we believe is culturally and normatively essential to teacher education. . . . I do not," argues Soltis, "think that we have been specific enough about the core of common content essential to the education of the literate professional. . .. What . . . is needed is a middle-range specification of what should be core and

common." [34]

Here is where our organization could make a substantive contribution to the strengthening and the justification of the social foundations of education as an integral component of any program of teacher preparation.

In a paper delivered during the 1990 AESA Convention in Lake Buena Vista, Florida, this writer suggested that "the project I have in mind would complement these publications, adding an additional, enlarging dimension to our knowledge and capability for tracing the evolution of significant ideas about education." [35] What I am suggesting is that we create a reference book which might be called a *Syntopicon of Foundational Knowledge*. It could become an instrument which could be of significant value to SFE educators, "providing them with a tool which would give them a common knowledge base, a common language system, both essential for the adequate framing of their discourses."[36]

Finally the Committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation, the ones responsible for authorizing Professor Tozer's construction of the position paper we are considering today, ought to draw on the dialogue which results from this symposium and other meetings held during this year's conference, reconstruct the paper in an appropriate fashion, and distribute multiple copies to every institution preparing teachers, to every policy making group, to every regulatory agency, in the country.

Summary:

This paper has made an effort to analyze the CLSE Standards booklet, and the draft position paper entitled "Toward a New Consensus Among

Social Foundations Educators," for the purpose of engaging in the ongoing conversation among foundations scholars about the aims and means of programs and instruction in the realm of the SFE. It concludes with a number of suggestions about what AESA might consider during the conversation which ensues as a means to achieving the dual end of sustaining the rich scholarship which historically has emerged from those engaged in the SFE, while at the same time emphasizing the need for foundational scholars everywhere to become actively involved in the political realm, both on and off campus, in an effort to persuade powerful campus and external forces of the vital need for prospective teachers to acquire the cognitive perspectives, the moral dispositions, the skills which can most often be obtained only through study in the SFE.

Reading Notes

1. Frankena, William K. (1965). Three historical philosophies of education. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company. 6.

2. Council of Learned Societies in Education. (1986, 1977). STANDARDS for academic and professional instruction in foundations of education, educational studies and educational policy studies. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Prakken Publications, Inc.

3. Draft Position Paper. (Nov. 1992). "Toward a new consensus among social foundations educators." American Educational Studies Association Committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation. Distributed to all members of the American Educational Studies Association in early August, 1992, for subsequent discussion and revision during the Annual AESA Conference, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, November4-8, 1992.

4. See for instance: Reynolds, Anne. (October1990). Old foundations and new teachers: Assessing the situation. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service. (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, Orlando, FL. Ms. Reynolds indicates clearly that "To define the content (of a new generation of teacher assessments) we're looking to state regulations, the research literature and job incumbents . . . To define the teacher actions and knowledge domains more fully, we've undertaken a series of studies employing job analysis survey methods . . . We have studies of teaching tasks at the elementary, moddle, and secondary school levels, enabling skills, general principles of teaching and learning,. . ." (pp. 3-4). Later in the paper she suggests a quite different definition of foundational thinking when she asserts that ". . . at ETS we've been practicing foundational thinking in education by conducting studies to define the knowledge base of teaching . . . One of the end products of our efforts is a new generation of teacher licensure assessments that reflects the thinking of experts in the field." (p. 11)

5. U.S. Department of Education. (April 18, 1991). America 2000: An education strategy. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. See pp. 14,31,33,35,42,52,53, and 59.

6. First Amendment of The Bill of Rights, U.S. Constitution. Passed by Congress on September 25, 1789. Ratified by the states on December 15, 1791. This amendment stipulates that: **"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;** or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for redress of grievances." (Bolded section by author to emphasize the first sixteen words.)

7. Haynes, Charles C. (1990). Religion in American history. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 44.

8. Americans United for Separation of Church and State. (n.d.) "The equal access act and the public schools: Questions and answers." Silver Spring, MD.

9. Bridges, David. (1979). Education, democracy, and discussion. Windsor, U.K.: NFER Publishing Company Ltd. 37-38.

10. Ibid., 38.

11. Adler, Mortimer J., Editor in Chief. (1971, 1952). "Language." In: The Great Ideas: 1: A syntopicon of great books of the Western World. Vol. 2 of: Robert Maynard Hutchins, Editor in Chief, Great books of the Western World. 944.

12. DeMello, Frank T. (October 7, 1992). Date of receipt of a postcard describing a survey being conducted by the Longman Publishing Group, 10 Bank Street, White Plains, N.Y., for the purpose of pinpointing the textbook needs for an introductory survey course which is often called *Introduction to Education* or *Foundations of Education.* (Italics mine).

13. Shulman, Lee S. (Spring 1990). "Reconnecting foundations to the substance of teacher education." In: Teachers College Record. 91:3: 309.

14. Ibid.

15. Bauer, Norman J. (1989). Foundational studies as a new liberal art: Educology. Geneseo, NY: State University of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 303 446)

16. Steiner, Elizabeth.(1981). Educology of the free. NY: Philosophical Library. (On page 50 Professor Steiner states: "On the basis of object of knowledge, I proposed 'educology' for that discipline that yields knowledge of education").

17. Tozer, Steven, Anderson, Thomas H. and Armbruster, Bonnie B. (Spring 1990). "Psychological and social foundations in teacher education: A thematic introduction." In: Teachers College Record. 91:3: 298-299

18. Draft Position Paper. Op. cit., 4.

19. Ibid., 4.

20. Ibid., 6.

21. Ibid., 7.

22. Ibid., 7

23. Ibid., 5.

24. Ibid., 6.

25. Dewey, John. (1946). "Challenge to liberal thought." In: Problems of men. New York: Philosophical Library.146.

26. Polyani, Michael. (1964, 1962). Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy. NY: Harper Torchbooks/The Academy Library.

27. Broudy, Harry. (Feb. 1979). "Tacit knowing as a rationale for liberal education." In: Teachers College Record. 80:446-462; "The brightest and the best." In: Phi Delta Kappan. 60:640-644.

28. Bauer, Norman J. (1989). "Physical models of schooling, the 'ought' question and educational change." Geneseo, NY: State University of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 311 582)

29. Draft Position Paper. Op. cit., 8.

30. Ibid., 6.

31. Ibid., 6.

32. Ibid., 8.

33. Ibid., 7.

34. Soltis, Jonas F. (Spring 1990). "A reconceptualization of educational foundations." In: Teachers College Record. 91:3: 315.

35. Bauer, Norman J. (1989). "Syntopical theory and the foundations of education." Geneseo, NY: State University of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 337 446). 12.

36. Ibid., 13